UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,137	11/09/2001	Vadim Maslov	113948-006	3219

24573	7590	06/10/2005

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC
PO BOX 1135
CHICAGO, IL 60690-1135

EXAMINER
SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This application has been examined. This is a continuation of S.N. 09/548718,

filed 4/13/2000, now U.S. Patent 6,538,673.

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

DaCosta et al (6826553).

4.   Regarding claim 1, DaCosta et al show: method for extracting digests from

structured online documents and monitoring the digests (Figures 2, 4, column 5 lines

15-36), recording the script that consists of commands that include loading the online

document in the source window, navigating the source online document and copying

the fragment of the document to the target window (column 5 lines 35-60, column 7

lines 28-55), saving the script in a computer readable medium (column 7 lines 45-60),

replaying the script using a computer to automatically generate an updated target

document from an updated source document (column 7 lines 55-67, column 8 lines 8-45).

5. Regarding claim 2, the online document includes any document that has hierarchical internal structure that can be represented by a tree (column 7 lines 30-54).

6. Regarding claim 3, the method employs a visual programming technique (column 8 lines 19-40).

7. Regarding claim 4, the visual programming technique provides at least a source window and target window for each script (Figures 11-13, column 8 lines 50-65, column 11 lines 30-50).

8. Regarding claim 5, the user can select a fragment of a source online document shown in a source window by clicking the fragment and to request creation of a script that finds the selected fragment in the current and subsequent versions of the source document (column 13 lines 15-50).

9. Regarding claim 6, a sequence of commands that comprise the script that extracts the fragment is generated (column 15 lines 20-60).

10.   Regarding claim 7, the generated list of commands include tree navigation

commands that lead from the root node to the node of the source document that

represents the fragment (column 14 lines 15-48).

11.   Regarding claim 8, the commands include a copy fragment command to transfer

contents from the source fragment to the target window (column 13 lines 35-60, column

17 lines 35-55).

12.   Regarding claim 9, the memorized commands are replayed at a subsequent time

to automatically create a digest of a new version of the online document (column 15

lines 20-60).

13.   Regarding claim 10, the digest is smaller than the document and is a fragment of

a course document made by the user to omit unnecessary and irrelevant graphics and

text (column 15 lines 30-50).

14.   Regarding claim 11, the script is replayed at predetermined time intervals

automatically (column 16 lines 14-35).

15.   Regarding claim 12, commands are recorded to form a script, identifying a

portion of a document to be copied to a target document and identifying a placeholder in

the target document to which the fragment is copied (column 13 lines 30-55, column 17 lines 35-55).

16.   Regarding claim 13, the copied document fragment is represented by a node in a tree representing the document (column 13 lines 30-55).

17.   Regarding claim 14, commands are recorded to form a script, recording navigation commands that navigate the document browser to the document (column 14 lines 15-48).

18.   Regarding claim 15, DaCosta et al show: method for extracting digests from structured online documents and monitoring the digests (Figures 2, 4, column 5 lines 15-36), recording the script that consists of commands that include loading the online document in the source window, navigating the source online document and copying the fragment of the document to the target window (column 5 lines 35-60, column 7 lines 28-55), saving the script in a computer readable medium (column 7 lines 45-60), replaying the script using a computer to automatically generate an updated target document from an updated source document (column 7 lines 55-67, column 8 lines 8-45).   The online document includes any document that has hierarchical internal structure that can be represented by a tree (column 7 lines 30-54). The script identifies a fragment of a structured document to be copied from a source document to a target document (column 13 lines 35-60).

19.   Regarding claim 16, the visual programming technique provides at least a source

window and target window for each script, that allows a user to select a fragment of a

source document to create a script that copied the fragment to the target window

(Figures 11-13, column 8 lines 50-65, column 11 lines 30-50).

20.   Regarding claim 17, the generated list of commands include tree navigation

commands that lead from the root node to the node of the source document that

represents the fragment (column 14 lines 15-48).

21.   Regarding claim 18, the commands include a copy fragment command to

transfer contents from the source fragment to the target window (column 13 lines 35-60,

column 17 lines 35-55).

22.   Regarding claim 19, the memorized commands are replayed at a subsequent

time to automatically create a digest of a new version of the online document (column

15 lines 20-60).

23.   Regarding claim 20, commands are recorded to form a script, recording

navigation commands that navigate the document browser to the document (column 14

lines 15-48).

24.   Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 4 recites

"navigating the three of the source online document..." which is not clear. It is assumed

that "three of the" is a typographical error. Appropriate correction is required.

25.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Steven P Sax whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 AM - 5:00

PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

***